arXiv:1402.3141v4 [math.FA] 7 May 2015

The heat equation for the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian with negative potentials: Existence and blow-up of nonnegative solutions

Ali BenAmor*†& Tarek Kenzizi‡

Abstract

We establish conditions ensuring either existence or blow-up of nonnegative solutions for the heat equation generated by the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian perturbed by negative potentials on bounded sets. The elaborated theory is supplied by some examples.

Key words: fractional Laplacian, heat equation, Dirichlet form.
MSC2010: 35K05, 35B09, 35S11.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we discuss the question of existence as well as blow-up of nonnegative solutions for negatively perturbed Dirichlet fractional Laplacian on open bounded subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$.
For every $0 < \alpha < \min(2, d)$ and every open bounded subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we designate by $L_0 := (-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}|_\Omega$ the fractional Laplacian with zero Dirichlet condition on Ω^c (as explained in the next section). We consider the associated perturbed heat (or parabolic) equation

$$\begin{cases} -\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} = L_0 u - Vu, \quad \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ u(t,\cdot) = 0, \ on \quad \Omega^c, \ \forall\, 0 < t < T \le \infty \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), \quad \text{for } a.e.\ x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $u_0 \ge 0$ is a Borel measurable square integrable function on Ω and $V \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ is a positive Borel function. The meaning of a solution for the equation (1.1) will be explained in the next section.
We emphasize that the potential V is not supposed to be in the (generalized) Kato class, so that the standard perturbation theory of Dirichlet forms does not help any more to

*corresponding author
†Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences of Gabès. Uni.Gabès, Tunisia. E-mail: ali.benamor@ipeit.rnu.tn
‡Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Sciences of Tunis, Uni. Tunis ElManar, Tunisia

decide wether a nonnegative solution occurs or not.
Even for the special case of a Hardy potential

$$V(x) = \frac{c}{|x|^\alpha},\ x \neq 0,\ c > 0 \tag{1.2}$$

only partial information about the problem are established in the literature, to our best knowledge. Indeed, if $0 \in \Omega$ one derives from the paper of Beldi–Belhaj Rhouma–BenAmor [BRB13], that for every $0 < c \leq c^* := \frac{2^\alpha \Gamma^2(\frac{d+\alpha}{4})}{\Gamma^2(\frac{d-\alpha}{4})}$, a nonnegative solution exists. However, there is no answer for $c > c^*$.
Our main task in this paper is to shed some light towards solving the problem by giving conditions ensuring existence as well as blow up of nonnegative solutions for (1.1).
Focusing on nonnegative solutions is motivated, among other reasons, by the fact that they are physical solutions on one hand and on the other one by the significance of the above considered operator in physics and in other area of natural sciences. For instance, the case $\alpha = 1/2$ corresponds to the nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation, whereas the general case models the so called Lévy motion or Lévy flights. For more about aspects of applications of the fractional Laplacian we refer the reader to [DSU08]. A prototype of application in biology is illustrated in [HWQ+12].
The inspiring point for us was the papers of Baras–Goldstein [BG84], Cabré–Martel [CM99] and Goldstein–Zhang [GZ03] where the problem was addressed and solved for the Dirichlet Laplacian (i.e. $\alpha = 2$). In the latter cited papers, the authors proved, in particular, that existence and nonexistence of nonnegative solutions in the case where the principal part of the equation is the Dirichlet Laplacian (or an elliptic operator) is related to the size of the bottom of the spectrum of the operator $-\Delta|_\Omega - V$. However, there is a substantial difference between the Laplacian and the fractional Laplacian. Whereas it is known that the first one is local and therefore suitable for describing diffusions, the second one is nonlocal and commonly used for describing superdiffusions (Lévy flights). These differences are reflected in the way of computing for both operators (Green formula, integration by part, Leibnitz formula....).
Nonetheless, we shall show that the method used in [CM99, GZ03] still apply in our setting. Especially, for the instantaneous blow-up part, which is the major novelty of this paper, adequate generalization of the intermediate results to the nonlocal case are established (see in particular, formula (2.26) and Theorem (4.1)). These extensions make it possible to carry over the method to the nonlocal setting.
As a conclusion we approve that the used method provides a unified approach for handling the local as well as the nonlocal case.

2 Preparing results

To state our main results, it is convenient to introduce the following notations.
From now on we fix an open bounded subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with Lipschitz boundary, a real number α such that $0 < \alpha < \min(2, d)$.
The Lebesgue spaces $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, dx)$, resp. $L^2(\Omega, dx)$ will be denoted by L^2, resp. $L^2(\Omega)$. We shall write $\int \cdots$ as a shorthand for $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \cdots$.

The letters C, c, C' will denote generic positive constants which may vary in value from line to line .
Consider the quadratic form $\mathcal{E}$ defined in L^2 by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(f,g) &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(d,\alpha)\int\int \frac{(f(x)-f(y))(g(x)-g(y))}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}}\,dxdy, \\ D(\mathcal{E}) &= W^{\alpha/2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{f\in L^2\colon\ \mathcal{E}[f] := \mathcal{E}(f,f) < \infty\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}(d,\alpha) = \frac{\alpha\Gamma(\frac{d+\alpha}{2})}{2^{1-\alpha}\pi^{d/2}\Gamma(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})}. \tag{2.2}$$

Using Fourier transform $\hat{f}(\xi) = \int e^{-ix\cdot\xi}f(x)\,dx$, a straightforward computation yields the following identity (see [FLS08, Lemma 3.1])

$$\int |\xi|^\alpha |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi = \mathcal{E}[f],\ \forall\, f\in W^{\alpha/2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{2.3}$$

It is well known that $\mathcal{E}$ is a transient Dirichlet form and is related (via Kato representation theorem) to the selfadjoint operator, commonly named the fractional Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and which we shall denote by $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$. We note that the domain of $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ is the fractional Sobolev space $W^{\alpha,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Having formula (2.3) in hands one can explicitly evaluate the fractional Laplacian:

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}f(x) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\big(|\cdot|^\alpha \hat{f}\big)(x),\ \forall\, f\in W^{\alpha,2}(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{2.4}$$

For an alternative and very interesting construction of the fractional Laplacian as a boundary operator we refer the reader to the paper [CS07].
Set $L_0 := (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}|_\Omega$ the localization of $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ on Ω, i.e., the operator which Dirichlet form in $L^2(\overline{\Omega}, dx)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{E}_\Omega) &= W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega)\colon = \{f\in W^{\alpha/2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)\colon\ f=0 \quad a.e.\ on\ \Omega^c\} \\ \mathcal{E}_\Omega(f,g) &= \mathcal{E}(f,g) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(d,\alpha)\int_\Omega\int_\Omega \frac{(f(x)-f(y))(g(x)-g(y))}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}}\,dx\,dy + \int_\Omega f(x)g(x)\kappa_\Omega(x)\,dx, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\kappa_\Omega(x) := \mathcal{A}(d,\alpha)\int_{\Omega^c}\frac{1}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}}\,dy. \tag{2.5}$$

The Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}_\Omega$ coincides with the closure of $\mathcal{E}$ restricted to $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, and is moreover regular, transient and the associated semigroup is irreducible even if Ω is not connected.
We shall use the notation $\mathcal{O}\subset\subset\Omega$ to mean that $\mathcal{O}$ is open and its closure lies in Ω.
For every open subset $\mathcal{O}\subset\mathbb{R}^d$ and every $0<T\le\infty$, we set $C_c^\infty\big([0,T)\times\mathcal{O}\big)$ the usual space of infinitely differentiable functions on $[0,T)\times\mathcal{O}$, having compact support in $[0,T)\times\mathcal{O}$.
We are in position at this stage to give the notion of solution for the heat equation (1.1).

Definition 2.1.
Let $0 < T \leq \infty$. A Borel measurable function $u : [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a solution of problem (1.1) if

1. $u \in \mathcal{L}^2_{loc}\big((0,T), L^2_{loc}(\Omega)\big)$.
2. For every $0 < t < T$, $u(t,\cdot) = 0$ *a.e.* on Ω^c.
3. $u \in L^1_{loc}\big((0,T)\times\Omega, dt \otimes V\,dx\big)$.
4. For every $0 \leq t < T$, every $\mathcal{O} \subset\subset \Omega$ and every $\phi \in C^\infty_c\big([0,T)\times\mathcal{O}\big)$, the following identity holds true

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{O}} \big((u\phi)(t,x) - u_0(x)\phi(0,x)\big)\,dx \;&+\; \int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}} u(s,x)(-\phi_s(s,x) + L_0\phi(s,x))\,dx\,ds \\ &= \int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}} u(s,x)\phi(s,x)V(x)\,dx\,ds. \qquad (2.6)\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.1. 1. We claim that all integrals involved in the definition are finite. Indeed, by assumptions on u and ϕ the first and the last as well as the first part of the second integrals are finite.
To show the finiteness of $\int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}} u(s,x)L_0\phi(s,x)\,dx\,ds$, it suffices to show that $L_0\phi$ is square integrable on $[0,T)\times\Omega$. To this end we use first the fact that for every $\psi \in C^\infty_c(\Omega)$ we have

$$L_0\psi(x) = (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\psi(x) \text{ on } \Omega. \qquad (2.7)$$

For every $\phi \in C^\infty_c\big([0,T)\times\Omega\big)$ we denote by ψ its extension by a function belonging to $C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Making use of Formulae (2.4)–(2.7) an elementary computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\int_\Omega \big|L_0\phi\big|^2(t,x)\,dt\,dx \;&\leq\; \int_{\mathbb{R}}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\psi|^2(t,x)\,dx\Big)\,dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\xi|^{2\alpha}|\hat\psi(t,\xi)|^2\,d\xi\Big)\,dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\xi|^{2\alpha}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\hat\psi(t,\xi)|^2\,dt\Big)\,d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |\xi|^{2\alpha}\big|\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}}\psi\big|^2(r,\xi)\,dr\,d\xi. \qquad (2.8)\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}}$ is Fourier transform in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. As $\psi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ we conclude that the last integral is finite and the claim is proved.

2. If $u \in \mathcal{L}^2_{loc}\big((0,T), L^2(\Omega)\big)$, then exhausting Ω by a sequence of open subsets $\mathcal{O}_k \subset\subset \Omega$ and using dominated convergence theorem we conclude that property (2.1-4) extends to $\mathcal{O} = \Omega$ as well.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $V \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then $u(t) = e^{-tL_V}u_0$ is a nonnegative global solution of problem (1.1).*

Proof. For every $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we designate by $L_V^{\mathcal{O}}$ the selfadjoint operator associated to the quadratic form

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{O}}^V := \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{O}} - V, \text{ in } L^2(\mathcal{O}). \tag{2.9}$$

Let $(\Omega_k) \subset\subset \Omega$ be such that $\Omega_k \uparrow \Omega$. Clearly $\mathcal{E}_{\Omega_k}^V \uparrow \mathcal{E}_{\Omega}^V$, yielding the strong convergence (see [Kat95, Theorem 3.1, p. 459])

$$\big(L_V^{\Omega_k} + \beta\big)^{-1} \to \big(L_V + \beta\big)^{-1}, \text{ strongly } \forall\, \beta > \|V\|_\infty. \tag{2.10}$$

Since the sequence $(\mathcal{E}_{\Omega_k}^V)$ is uniformly lower semibounded it is well known (see [Kat95, Theorem 2.16, p.504]) that strong convergence of resolvents implies strong convergence of the related semigroups locally uniformly in t, i.e.

$$e^{-tL_V^{\Omega_k}} \to e^{-tL_V}, \text{ strongly } \forall\, t > 0 \tag{2.11}$$

and locally uniformly in t.
Set $v_k(t) = e^{-tL_V^{\Omega_k}} u_0$, $u(t) = e^{-tL_V} u_0$ and fix $\mathcal{O} \subset\subset \Omega$. Then $\mathcal{O} \subset \Omega_k$ for large k. Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty\big((0,\infty) \times \mathcal{O}\big)$. We manipulate ϕ as being an element from $C_c^\infty(\Omega_k)$ in its spatial variable for large k and use the fact $C_c^\infty(\Omega_k) \subset D(L_0^{\Omega_k})$ and that

$$L_0^{\Omega_k}\phi|_{\mathcal{O}} = L_0^{\mathcal{O}}\phi = L_0\phi|_{\mathcal{O}} \text{ for large } k, \tag{2.12}$$

we achieve from the definition of v_k, for large k and every $t > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_k} \big((v_k\phi)(t,x) - u_0(x)\phi(0,x)\big)\, dx \;&+\; \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_k} v_k(s,x)(-\phi_s(s,x) + L_0^{\Omega_k}\phi(s,x))\, dx\, ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_k} v_k(s,x)\phi(s,x)V(x)\, dx\, ds. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

The above mentioned observations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{O}} \big((v_k\phi)(t,x) - u_0(x)\phi(0,x)\big)\, dx \;&+\; \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} v_k(s,x)(-\phi_s(s,x) + L_0^{\Omega_k}\phi(s,x))\, dx\, ds \\ &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} v_k(s,x)\phi(s,x)V(x)\, dx\, ds \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}} \big((v_k\phi)(t,x) - u_0(x)\phi(0,x)\big)\, dx + \\ &\quad \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} v_k(s,x)(-\phi_s(s,x) + L_0\phi(s,x))\, dx\, ds. \end{aligned}$$

From the strong convergence, locally uniformly in t of the semigroups, we get $v_k(t) \to u(t)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ and in particular in $L^2(\mathcal{O})$. Finally the result follows from dominated convergence theorem. □

In the sequel we designate by

$$\lambda_0^V := \inf_{\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi] - \int \phi^2 V\, dy}{\int \phi^2\, dx}. \tag{2.14}$$

From now on, we set $V_k := V \wedge k$ and we denote by (P_k) the heat equation corresponding to the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian perturbed by $-V_k$ instead of $-V$:

$$(P_k)\colon \begin{cases} -\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} = L_0 u - V_k u, \quad \text{in } (0,T)\times\Omega, \\ u(t,\cdot) = 0, \ on \quad \Omega^c, \ \forall\, 0 < t < T \le \infty, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), \quad \text{for } a.e.\ x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

Having Proposition 2.1 in mind, we already know that the problem (P_k) has a nonnegative energy solution given by

$$u_k(t) := e^{-tL_k} u_0, \ t > 0,$$

where L_k is the selfadjoint operator associated to the closed quadratic form $\mathcal{E}_\Omega - V_k$. Furthermore, the solution u_k lies in the space $W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty$ in its spacial variable, is continuous in its time variable and satisfies Duhamel's formula:

$$u_k(t,x) \;=\; e^{-tL_0}u_0(x) + \int_0^t \int_\Omega p_{t-s}(x,y) u_k(s,x) V_k(y)\, dy\, ds, \tag{2.16}$$

where p_t is the heat kernel of the operator e^{-tL_0}, $t > 0$.
The following properties of the sequence (u_k) are crucial for the later development of the paper.

Lemma 2.1. *i) The sequence (u_k) is increasing.*

ii) If problem (1.1) has a nonnegative solution u then $u_k \le u$, $\forall\, k$. Moreover $\lim_{k\to\infty} u_k$ is a nonnegative solution of problem (1.1) as well.

Proof. i) By Duhamel's formula, one has

$$\begin{aligned} u_{k+1}(t) - u_k(t) \;&=\; e^{-tL_{k+1}}u_0 - e^{-tL_k}u_0 = \int_0^t e^{-(t-s)L_k} e^{-sL_{k+1}} (u_0 V_{k+1} - u_0 V_k)(s)\, ds \\ &\ge\; 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

ii) We follow an idea of Goldstein–Goldstein–Rhandi [GGR12, Prop.4.1]. Let u be as stated in the lemma. Let $0 < t < T$, $\mathcal{O} \subset\subset \Omega$ be fixed and $\phi \in C_c^\infty\big([0,t)\times\mathcal{O}\big)$ be positive. From the definition of a solution together with the fact that $L_0\phi|_{\mathcal{O}} = L_0^{\mathcal{O}}\phi$ we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} (u_k(s) - u(s))(-\phi_s(s) + L_0^{\mathcal{O}}\phi(s) - V_k\phi(s))\, ds\, dx \;&=\; \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{O}} u\phi(V_k - V)\, ds\, dx \\ &\le\; 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Let us introduce the Hilbert space H_t as being the completion of $C_c^\infty\big([0,t)\times\mathcal{O}\big)$ with respect to the norm

$$N(\phi) := \big(\|\phi\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\mathcal{O})} + \|\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial s}\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\mathcal{O})} + \|L_0^{\mathcal{O}}\phi\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\mathcal{O})}\big)^{1/2}, \tag{2.19}$$

and H_t^+ the positive cone of H_t.
Having (2.18) in hands and using a denseness argument we obtain the following inequality

$$\int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}}(u_k(s)-u(s))(-\phi_s(s)+L_0^{\mathcal{O}}\phi(s)-V_k\phi(s))\,ds\,dx\le 0,\ \forall\,\phi\in H_t^+. \tag{2.20}$$

Observe that, by the closedness of the operator $L_0^{\mathcal{O}}$ the space H_t is nothing else but the space of functions ϕ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi\in L^2((0,t)\times\mathcal{O}),\ \text{the weak derivative } \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial s}\in L^2((0,t)\times\mathcal{O}),\\ &\phi(t,\cdot)\in D(L_0^{\mathcal{O}}) \text{ and } L_0^{\mathcal{O}}\phi\in L^2((0,t)\times\mathcal{O}).\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Let $\psi\in C_c^\infty\big((0,t)\times\mathcal{O}\big)$ be nonnegative and consider the parabolic problem: find $\phi\in H_t$ solving the equation

$$-\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial s} = -L_0^{\mathcal{O}}\phi + V_k\phi+\psi \text{ in } (0,t)\times\mathcal{O},\ \phi(0,\cdot)=0. \tag{2.22}$$

Then the latter problem has a positive solution which is given by (see [Kat95, Theorem 1.27, p.493])

$$\phi(s)=\int_0^s e^{-(s-\xi)(L_0^{\mathcal{O}}-V_k)}\psi(\xi)\,d\xi, \tag{2.23}$$

and hence is nonnegative. Plugging into equation (2.18) yields

$$\int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}}(u_k-u)\psi\,ds\,dx\le 0,\ \forall\,0\le\psi\in C_c^\infty\big((0,t)\times\mathcal{O}\big). \tag{2.24}$$

As t and $\mathcal{O}$ are arbitrary we obtain that $u_k\le u$.
Let us prove that the limit of the sequence (u_k) is a nonnegative solution.
Set $u_\infty := \lim_{k\to\infty}u_k$. Obviously $u_\infty(t,\cdot)=0$ *a.e.* on Ω^c for every $t\in(0,T)$. On the other hand we have by the first step of (ii), $0\le u_\infty\le u$ and therefore

$$u_\infty\in\mathcal{L}^2_{loc}\big((0,T),L^2_{loc}(\Omega)\big)\cap L^1_{loc}\big([0,T)\times\Omega, dt\otimes V\,dx\big).$$

Being solution of the heat equation (P_k), the u_k's satisfy: for every $0\le t<T$, every $\mathcal{O}\subset\subset\Omega$ and every $\phi\in C_c^\infty\big([0,T)\times\mathcal{O}\big)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{O}}\big((u_k\phi)(t,x)-u_0(x)\phi(0,x)\big)\,dx+\int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}}u_k(s,x)\big(-\phi_s(s,x)+L_0\phi(s,x)\big)\,dx\,ds\\ =\int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}}u_k(s,x)\phi(s,x)V_k(x)\,dx\,ds.\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

By dominated convergence theorem we conclude that u_∞ satisfies equation (2.6) as well, which ends the proof. □

The following lemma is inspired from the 'gradient' case where integration by parts is used. It extends without major difficulties for abstract nonlocal Dirichlet forms.

Lemma 2.2. *Let u_k be the nonnegative solution of the approximate problem (P_k) and $\phi \in W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty$ which support lies in Ω. Then $\frac{\phi^2}{u_k} \in W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega)$ and*

$$\mathcal{E}_\Omega(u_k, \frac{\phi^2}{u_k}) \leq \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi]. \tag{2.26}$$

Proof. It suffices to give the proof for positive ϕ. Let $\phi \geq 0$ and u_k be as specified in the lemma. As $\mathcal{E}_\Omega$ is a Dirichlet form, to prove the first part it suffices to prove that $\frac{\phi}{u_k} \in W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty$.
Clearly for every compact subset $K \subset \Omega$ there is a constant $\kappa_k > 0$ such that $u_k \geq \kappa_k$ on K and then $\frac{\phi}{u_k} \in L^\infty$. To show that the latter function has finite energy we shall proceed directly.
An elementary computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\phi(x)}{u_k(x)} - \frac{\phi(y)}{u_k(y)} &= \phi(x)\Big(\frac{1}{u_k(x)} - \frac{1}{u_k(y)}\Big) + \frac{1}{u_k(y)}\Big(\phi(x) - \phi(y)\Big) \\
&= \frac{\phi(x)}{u_k(x)u_k(y)}\Big(u_k(y) - u_k(x)\Big) + \frac{1}{u_k(y)}\Big(\phi(x) - \phi(y)\Big), \qquad (2.27)
\end{aligned}$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\frac{\phi(x)}{u_k(x)} - \frac{\phi(y)}{u_k(y)}\Big)^2 &\leq \frac{2\phi^2(x)}{u_k^2(x)u_k^2(y)}\Big(u_k(y) - u_k(x)\Big)^2 + \frac{2}{u_k^2(y)}\Big(\phi(x) - \phi(y)\Big)^2 \\
&\leq 2\max(\frac{\|\phi\|_\infty^2}{\kappa_k^4}, \frac{1}{\kappa_k^2})\Big[\Big(u_k(y) - u_k(x)\Big)^2 + \Big(\phi(x) - \phi(y)\Big)^2\Big] \\
&\leq C\Big[\Big(u_k(y) - u_k(x)\Big)^2 + \Big(\phi(x) - \phi(y)\Big)^2\Big]. \qquad (2.28)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_\Omega[\frac{\phi}{u_k}] \leq C\big(\mathcal{E}_\Omega[u_k] + \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi]\big) < \infty, \tag{2.29}$$

yielding that $\frac{\phi}{u_k} \in W_0^{\frac{\alpha}{2},2}(\Omega)$.
We proceed now to prove inequality (2.26). A straightforward computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(u_k(x) - u_k(y))(\frac{\phi^2(x)}{u_k(x)} - \frac{\phi^2(y)}{u_k(y)}) &= \phi^2(x) + \phi^2(y) \\
&- \frac{u_k(x)}{u_k(y)}\phi^2(y) - \frac{u_k(y)}{u_k(x)}\phi^2(x) \\
&= \phi^2(x) + \phi^2(y) - \frac{u_k^2(x)\phi^2(y) + u_k^2(y)\phi^2(x)}{u_k(x)u_k(y)} \\
&\leq (\phi(x) - \phi(y))^2. \qquad (2.30)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_\Omega(u_k,\frac{\phi^2}{u_k}) &= \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{A}(d,\alpha)\int_\Omega\int_\Omega \frac{(u_k(x)-u_k(y))(\frac{\phi^2}{u_k}(x)-\frac{\phi^2}{u_k}(y))}{|x-y|^{d+\alpha}}\,dx\,dy+\int_\Omega \phi^2(x)\kappa_\Omega(x)\,dx\\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi], \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

which was to be proved. □

By the end of this section, we give a technical result dealing about the comparability of the ground state of the operator L_0 that will be needed in the proof of the nonexistence part.

Lemma 2.3. *Set $\varphi_0>0$ the normalized ground state of the operator L_0 and $h(t,x):=e^{-tL_0}u_0(x)$ for every $t>0$ and every $x\in\Omega$. Then*

$$h(t,\cdot)\sim\varphi_0 \text{ for every fixed } t>0. \tag{2.32}$$

Proof. By a result due to Kaleta–Kulczycki [KK10], the operator e^{-tL_0} is intrinsically ultracontractive. Hence $p_t(x,y)\leq c_t\varphi_0(x)\varphi_0(y)$, which leads to $h(t,x)\leq c_t\varphi_0(x)$.
The reversed inequality follows from the intrinsic ultracontractivity as well (see [DS84, p.13]). □

3 Existence of nonnegative solutions

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that $\lambda_0^V>-\infty$. Then the heat equation (1.1) has at least one nonnegative global solution.*

The substance of Theorem 3.1 may be established using [Sto87, Proposition 2.1] or [Voi86, Proposition 5.7]. However, for the convenience of the reader we shall give an adapted proof.

Proof. We follow the local case [CM99, GZ03].
Let $u_n(t)=e^{-tL_n}u_0,\ t>0$. By Proposition 2.1, u_n is a global solution of the approximate problem (P_n). Then, since u_n lies in the domain of the operator L_n, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u_n\|_{L^2}^2 = -2(L_nu_n,u_n)\leq -2\lambda_0^V\int_\Omega u_n^2(t,x)\,dx. \tag{3.1}$$

The latter inequality is an immediate consequence of the finiteness of λ_0^V. Hence by Gronwall's lemma we achieve the upper estimate

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2}\leq\|u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}e^{-\lambda_0^Vt},\forall\, t>0. \tag{3.2}$$

Thus the sequence (u_n) increases to a nonnegative function u for every $t>0$ and a.e. $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$. Furthermore $u=0,\ a.e.$ on Ω^c and $u\in\mathcal{L}^2_{loc}\big((0,\infty),L^2(\Omega)\big)$.
We are in position now to prove that u solves the heat equation (1.1). Indeed, having

Duhamel's formula for the u_n's in hands, we conclude by monotone convergence theorem that

$$u(t,x) \;=\; e^{-tL_0}u_0(x) + \int_0^t \int_\Omega p_{t-s}(x,y)u(s,y)\,V\,dy\,ds, \tag{3.3}$$

Since $p_t > 0,\ t > 0$ on $\Omega\times\Omega$ the latter formula implies, that $u \in L^1_{loc}\big((0,\infty)\times\Omega, dt\otimes V\,dx\big)$. Now utilizing the equation fulfilled by the u_n's being solutions of the P_n's we obtain by dominated convergence theorem, for every $t \geq 0$ every $\mathcal{O} \subset\subset \Omega$ and every $\phi \in C_c^\infty\big([0,\infty)\times\mathcal{O}\big)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{O}} u\phi|_0^t\,dx + \int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}} u(t,x)(-\phi_t(t,x) + L_0\phi(t,x))\,dx\,dt \\ = \int_0^t\int_{\mathcal{O}} u(t,x)\phi(t,x)V(x)\,dx\,dt.\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

□

Remark 3.1. For every $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that $u_0 \geq 0$ and every $t > 0$, we define

$$T_t u_0 := u(t,\cdot), \tag{3.5}$$

where $u(t,x)$ is the solution constructed in the latter proof. Then

$$||T_t u_0|| \leq e^{-\lambda_0^V t}||u_0||,\ \forall\, t > 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Now for each $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and every $t > 0$, we set

$$T_t u_0 := T_t u_0^+ - T_t u_0^-. \tag{3.7}$$

Then an elementary computation yields

$$||T_t u_0|| \leq e^{-\lambda_0^V t}||u_0||,\ \forall\, t > 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Thereby, we construct a family of linear selfadjoint operators

$$T_t\colon\ L^2(\Omega) \to L^2(\Omega),\ u_0 \mapsto T_t u_0, \tag{3.9}$$

such that

$$\|T_t\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq e^{-\lambda_0^V t},\ \forall\, t > 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Furthermore the family $(T_t)_{t>0}$ satisfies the semigroup property and is strongly continuous.

4 Blow-up of nonnegative solutions

In order to prove the blow-up part we are going first, to establish an estimate for the integral $\int \ln u$, whenever u is a nonnegative solution. Such estimate has an independent interest and is involved to derive regularity properties for the solutions. Furthermore we shall use it to give necessary condition for the existence of exponentially bounded solutions. Its use in our context is inspired from the one corresponding to the Dirichlet-Laplacian (see [CM99, GZ03]).

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that u is a nonnegative solution of the heat equation (1.1). Then for all $0 < t_1 < t_2 < T$, and all $\Phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\int_\Omega \Phi^2\, V\, dx - \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\Phi] \leq \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \int_\Omega \ln\Big(\frac{u(t_2)}{u(t_1)}\Big)\Phi^2\, dx. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Pick a function $\Phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$. Without loss of generality we may and shall suppose that $\int \Phi^2\, dx = 1$. As u_n is a solution of the heat equation and $\frac{\Phi^2}{u_n} \in W_0^{\alpha/2}(\Omega)$ (see Lemma 2.2), using the energy estimate of Lemma 2.2 we achieve

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \Phi^2\, V_n\, dx &= \int_\Omega (\partial_t u_n)\frac{\Phi^2}{u_n} dx + \mathcal{E}_\Omega(u_n, \frac{\Phi^2}{u_n}) \\
&= \frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega (\ln u_n)\Phi^2 dx + \mathcal{E}_\Omega(u_n, \frac{\Phi^2}{u_n}) \\
&\leq \frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega (\ln u_n)\Phi^2\, dx + \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\Phi].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Hence, integrating between t_1 and t_2 we achieve,

$$\int_\Omega \Phi^2\, V_n\, dx - \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\Phi] \leq \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \int_\Omega \ln\Big(\frac{u_n(t_2)}{u_n(t_1)}\Big)\Phi^2\, dx. \tag{4.3}$$

On the other hand using Lemma 2.1 together with Jensen's inequality we achieve

$$-\infty < \int_\Omega \ln u_n(t_i)\, \Phi^2 dx \leq \ln\big(\int_\Omega u_n(t_i)\, \Phi^2 dx\big) \leq \ln\big(\int_\Omega u(t_i)\, \phi^2 dx\big) < \infty,\ i = 1, 2. \tag{4.4}$$

Finally, we pass to the limit and use monotone convergence theorem to obtain inequality (4.1), which finishes the proof. □

On the light of Theorem 3.1 we together with Theorem 4.1, we get a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a nonnegative exponentially bounded global solution.

Let us mention that the following proposition was also proved in [KLVW, Theorem 4.2], in a more general context, however with a different proof.

Proposition 4.1. *The heat equation (1.1) has a nonnegative exponentially bounded global solution if and only if $\lambda_0^V > -\infty$.*

Proof. We have already established the sufficiency part in Theorem 3.1.
Conversely, assume that equation (1.1) has a nonnegative solution u such that

$$\|u(t)\| \leq Ce^{\omega t},\ \forall\, t > 0.$$

Choosing in Theorem 4.1 $t_2 = t > t_1 = 1$, $\Phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\int \Phi^2\, dx = 1$ and apply Jensen's inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \Phi^2\, V\, dx - \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\Phi] &\leq \frac{1}{t-1}\ln\big(\int_\Omega u(t)\Phi^2\, dx\big) - \frac{1}{t-1}\int \ln(u(1))\Phi^2\, dx \\ &\leq \frac{\ln(Ce^{wt})}{t-1} + \frac{\ln(\|\Phi^2\|)}{t-1} - \frac{1}{t-1}\int \ln(u(1))\Phi^2\, dx. \qquad (4.5)\end{aligned}$$

Letting $t \to \infty$, yields $\lambda_0^V > \infty$. □

We are in position yet, to give a condition ensuring absence of nonnegative solution as well as instantaneous blow up.

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that $\lambda_0^{(1-\epsilon)V} = -\infty$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then the heat equation (1.1) has no nonnegative solution. Moreover all nonnegative solutions blow up completely and instantaneously, i.e.: $\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n(t,x) = \infty$ for every $t > 0$ and every $x \in \Omega$, where u_n is the solution of (P_n).*

Proof. Assume that a nonnegative solution u exists. Relying on Lemma 2.1 we may and shall assume that u is the increasing limit of the u_n's.
Let $0 < \rho \in C_0(\Omega)$ (the space of continuous functions on Ω vanishing on $\partial\Omega$) be such that $\ln\rho \in L^p(\Omega)$ for any $p > 1$.
Claim: There exists at most one point $t_1 \in (0,T)$ such that $u(t_1,\cdot)\rho \in L^1(\Omega)$. Indeed, suppose that the contrary holds true. Then there exist $t_1,\ t_2 \in (0,T)$ such that $t_2 > t_1$ and for $i = 1, 2$ $u(t_i,\cdot)\rho \in L^1(\Omega)$.
For a small $\eta > 0$, set

$$\Omega_\eta :\ = \{x \in \Omega :\ \delta(x) := dist(x, \Omega^c) \geq \eta\}. \qquad (4.6)$$

Note that $u(t_i,x)\rho(x) \geq c > 0$ when $x \in \Omega_\eta$ for some c depending on t_i and η. Thus using Jensen's inequality twice we first get that $\ln(u(t_i,\cdot)\rho) \in L^1(\Omega_\eta)$ and then

$$\int_{\Omega_\eta} \big|\ln\big((u(t_i,x)\rho(x)\big)\big|^p dx < \infty. \qquad (4.7)$$

Now we decompose the set $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\eta$ into:

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega \setminus \Omega_\eta &= S_1 \cup S_2 \qquad (4.8)\\ &= \{x \in \Omega_\eta^c :\ u(t_i,x)\rho(x) \geq m\} \cup \{x \in \Omega_\eta^c :\ u(t_i,x)\rho(x) < m\}. \qquad (4.9)\end{aligned}$$

Observing that $\ln^p s$ is a concave function of s, for $s \geq e^{p-1}$, we choose m sufficiently large and apply Jensen's inequality on S_1, to derive that, for any $p > 1$,

$$\int_{S_1} |\ln\Big((u(t_i,x)\rho(x)\Big)|^p\, dx \ \leq\ C\ln^p\Big(\int_{S_1} u(t_i,x)\rho(x)\, dx\Big) < \infty. \qquad (4.10)$$

For $x \in S_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m > u(t_i,x)\rho(x) &= \Big[\int_\Omega p_{t_i}(x,y)u_0(y)dy && (4.11)\\ &+ \int_0^{t_i}\int_\Omega p_{t_i-s}(x,y)u(y,s)\,V\,dy\,ds\Big]\rho(x)\\ &\geq \int_\Omega p_{t_i}(x,y)u_0(y)dy\rho(x) && (4.12)\\ &:= h(t_i,x)\rho(x),\ i=1,2. && (4.13)\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\ln m \geq \ln\big(u(t_i,x)\rho(x)\big) &= \ln\big(\frac{u(t_i,x)\rho(x)}{h(t_i,x)\rho(x)}\big)+\ln\big(h(t_i,x)\rho(x)\big)\\ &\geq \ln\big(h(t_i,x)\rho(x)\big), && (4.14)\end{aligned}$$

leading to the estimate

$$|\ln(u(t_i,x)\rho(x))| \leq |\ln m| + |\ln(h(t_i,x)\rho(x))|,\ i=1,2. \tag{4.15}$$

As Ω has Lipschitz boundary it is known that (see [CKS10])

$$\varphi_0 \geq C\delta^{\alpha/2}. \tag{4.16}$$

Thus by Jensen's inequality together with Lemma 2.3 we get that

$$\int_{S_2} |\ln[h(t_i,x)\rho(x)]|^p dx < \infty. \tag{4.17}$$

Therefore $u(t_i,\cdot) \in L^p(\Omega),\ i=1,2.$
Now we conclude that

$$\ln\frac{u(t_2,\cdot)}{u(t_1,\cdot)} = \ln\Big(u(t_2,\cdot)\rho(.)\Big) - \ln\Big(u(t_1,\cdot)\rho(.)\Big) \in L^p(\Omega),\ \forall\, p>1. \tag{4.18}$$

On the other hand it is well known that, being in the space $L^p(\Omega)$ for $p > d/\alpha$, the function $\ln\frac{u(t_2,\cdot)}{u(t_1,\cdot)}$ is in fact in the Kato class and whence it satisfies the following: For any $r>0$, there exists $C(r)>0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{t_2-t_1}\int_\Omega \ln\frac{u(t_2,x)}{u(t_1,x)}\Phi^2(x)\,dx \leq r\mathcal{E}_\Omega(\Phi) + C(r)\int_\Omega \Phi^2(x)\,dx,\ \forall\,\Phi\in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \tag{4.19}$$

Having inequality (4.1) in hands, we achieve

$$\int_\Omega \Phi^2(x)V\,dx - \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\Phi] \leq r\mathcal{E}_\Omega(\Phi) + C(r)\int_\Omega \Phi^2(x)\,dx,\ \forall\,\Phi\in C_c^\infty(\Omega). \tag{4.20}$$

Therefore for every $\Phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\int_\Omega \Phi^2\,dx = 1$, we have

$$\frac{-C(r)}{1+r} \leq \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\Phi] - (1+r)^{-1}\int_\Omega \Phi^2\,V\,dx. \tag{4.21}$$

Whence

$$\lambda_0^{(1+r)^{-1}V} > -\infty, \ \forall\, r > 0, \tag{4.22}$$

which contradicts the assumption of the theorem and the claim is finally proved.
Given $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in (0,T)$, we take $\rho = \rho(y) = p_{\frac{t}{2}}(x,y)$. Owing to the sharp estimate of Lemma 2.3 together with the lower bound (4.16), we conclude that $\ln \rho \in L^p(\Omega)$ as was the case for h.
On the other hand from the properties of the heat kernel for the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian, we have $\rho(y) > 0$ for any $y \in \Omega$.
If there is no $s \in (0, \frac{t}{2}]$ such that $\rho(\cdot)u(s,\cdot) \in L^1(\Omega)$, then by using Duhamel's principle, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(t,x) &= e^{-\frac{t}{2}L_0}u(\frac{t}{2},x) + \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^{t}\int_\Omega p_s(x,y)u(s,y)V(y)\,dyds \\ &\geq e^{-\frac{t}{2}L_0}u(\frac{t}{2},x) \\ &= \int_\Omega p_{\frac{t}{2}}(x,y)u(\frac{t}{2},y)\,dy = \int_\Omega \rho(y)u(\frac{t}{2},y)\,dy = \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

In case $s \in (0, \frac{t}{2}]$ is the only point such that $\rho(.)u(.,s) \in L^1(\Omega)$, making use of Duhamel's principle once again, we obtain

$$u\big(\frac{(t+s)}{2},x\big) \geq \int_\Omega p_{\frac{t}{2}}(x,y)u(\frac{s}{2},y)\,dy = \int_\Omega \rho(y)u(\frac{s}{2},y)\,dy = \infty. \tag{4.24}$$

From the intrinsic ultracontractivity property for the semigroup e^{-tL_0}, we derive that for very $x \in \Omega$, every $r > 0$ such that $B_r(x) \subset \Omega$ and every $z \in B_r(x)$, and every small $\gamma > 0$, there is a constant $= c(t,\gamma,r)$ such that

$$p_{\frac{t+\gamma r}{2}}(z,y) \geq C p_{\frac{t}{2}}(x,y), \ \forall\, y \in \Omega. \tag{4.25}$$

Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\frac{t+\gamma r}{2}}(z,y) &\sim \varphi_0(z)\varphi_0(y) \geq c\frac{\inf_{B_r(x)}\varphi_0}{\sup_{B_r(x)}\varphi_0}\varphi_0(x)\varphi_0(y) \\ &\sim p_{\frac{t}{2}}(x,y). \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

Making use of the latter claim we achieve, for every $z \in B_r(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} u(\frac{t+s+\gamma r}{2},z) &\geq e^{-(\frac{t+\gamma r}{2})L_0}u(\frac{s}{2},z) = \int_\Omega p_{\frac{t+\gamma r}{2}}(z,y)u(\frac{s}{2},y)\,dy \\ &\geq c\int_\Omega p_{\frac{t}{2}}(x,y)u(\frac{s}{2},y)\,dy \geq \int_\Omega \rho(y)u(\frac{s}{2},y)\,dy = \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

By the semigroup property (or Duhamel's formula) once again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u(t,x) &\geq \int_\Omega p_{\frac{t-s-\gamma r}{2}}(x,z)u(\frac{t+s+\gamma r}{2},z)dz \\ &\geq \int_{B_r(x)} p_{\frac{t-s-\gamma r}{2}}(x,z)u(\frac{t+s+\gamma r}{2},z)\,dz = \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

as $u(\frac{t+s+\gamma r}{2}, z) = \infty$ on $B_r(x)$. Since (t, x) is arbitrary, this proves the blow-up and the proof is finished. □

5 Examples

In this section we provide some examples that support the already developed theory.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that there is $\lambda > 1$ and a sequence of balls $B_k \subset \Omega$ such that their Lebesgue volumes $|B_k| \downarrow 0$ and a sequence $(\phi_k) \subset C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ with $Supp\, \phi_k \subset B_k$, $\int \phi_k^2(x)\, dx = 1$, $\forall\, k$ such that*

$$\int \phi_k^2(x)\, V\, dx \geq \lambda \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi_k],\ \forall\, k. \tag{5.1}$$

Then the heat equation (1.1), has no nonnegative solution.

Proof. As a consequence of the condition given in the lemma, there is $\lambda' > 1$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(1-\epsilon) \int \phi_k^2(x)\, V\, dx \geq \lambda' \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi_k],\ \forall\, k. \tag{5.2}$$

Thus

$$-\mathcal{E}_{B_k}[\phi_k] + (1-\epsilon) \int \phi_k^2(x)\, V\, dx \geq (\lambda' - 1)\mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi_k] \geq c|B_k|^{-\alpha/d},\ \forall\, k. \tag{5.3}$$

Hence $\lambda_0^{(1-\epsilon)V}(B_k) \leq -c|B_k|^{-\alpha/d} \to -\infty$, as $k \to \infty$. Now observing that

$$\lambda_0^{(1-\epsilon)V}(B_k) \geq \lambda_0^{(1-\epsilon)V}, \tag{5.4}$$

yields the result. □

Example 5.1. *Hardy potential with interior singularity.*
Let $\alpha < \min(2, d)$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ an open bounded subset with Lipschitz boundary and containing 0. Set $V_c(x) = \frac{c}{|x|^\alpha}$, $x \neq 0$ and $c \geq 0$. If $0 \leq c \leq c^* := \frac{2^\alpha \Gamma^2(\frac{d+\alpha}{4})}{\Gamma^2(\frac{d-\alpha}{4})}$, then the heat equation associated to L_{V_c} has a nonnegative solution (owing to Hardy's inequality). However if $c > c^*$ then the heat equation has no nonnegative solution. Indeed, owing to the sharpness of the Hardy's inequality

$$\int_\Omega \frac{f^2(x)}{|x|^\alpha}\, dx \leq \frac{1}{c^*} \mathcal{E}_\Omega[f],\ \forall\, f \in W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega), \tag{5.5}$$

there is $\lambda > 1$ and a sequence $(\phi_k) \subset C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\int \phi_k^2(x) V(x)\, dx \geq \lambda \mathcal{E}_\Omega[\phi_k],\ \forall\, k. \tag{5.6}$$

Now an elementary computation shows that the sequence ψ_k defined by $\psi_k(x) = \phi_k(kx)$ and $B_k := B_{R/k}$ fulfills the conditions of Lemma 5.1.
Let us emphasize at this stage, that while for $0 \leq c < c^*$, $u(t) \in W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega),\ \forall\, t > 0$, it is not the case for the critical constant c^*. In fact, according to [BRB13, Theorem 4.2] in the critical case we have

$$u(t) \sim |\cdot|^{-\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} \delta^{\alpha/2},\ \text{for large } t,\ \text{where } \delta(x) = dist(x, \Omega^c). \tag{5.7}$$

Using Hardy's inequality once again we recognize that $|\cdot|^{-\frac{d-\alpha}{2}} \delta^{\alpha/2} \notin W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega)$.

Example 5.2. *Hardy potential with boundary singularity.*
Assume that the following Hardy's inequality holds true

$$\int \frac{f^2(x)}{\delta^\alpha(x)}\, dx \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \mathcal{E}_\Omega[f],\ \forall\, f \in W_0^{\alpha/2,2}(\Omega), \tag{5.8}$$

with sharp constant $1/\kappa^*$. Take $V_\kappa = \frac{\kappa}{\delta^\alpha(x)},\ \kappa \geq 0$. Arguing as in Example 5.1, we conclude that for $\kappa > \kappa^*$, the related heat equation has no nonnegative solution, whereas it has for $\kappa \leq \kappa^*$.
According to [CS03, Corollary 2.4], inequality (5.8) is satisfied if $d \geq 2$ and $\alpha \neq 1$.

References

[BG84] P. Baras and J. A. Goldstein. The heat equation with a singular potential. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 284(1):121–139, 1984.

[BRB13] Ali Beldi, Nedra Belhaj Rhouma, and Ali BenAmor. Pointwise estimates for the ground state of singular Dirichlet fractional Laplacian. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 46(44):445201, 2013.

[CKS10] Zhen-Qing Chen, Panki Kim, and Renming Song. Heat kernel estimates for the Dirichlet fractional Laplacian. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 12(5):1307–1329, 2010.

[CM99] Xavier Cabré and Yvan Martel. Existence versus explosion instantanée pour des équations de la chaleur linéaires avec potentiel singulier. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 329(11):973–978, 1999.

[CS03] Z.Q. Chen and R. Song. Hardy inequality for censored stable processes. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 55(3):439–450, 2003.

[CS07] L. Caffarelli and L. Sylvestre. An extension problem related to the fractional Laplacian. *Comm. in Part. Diff. Eq.*, 32(8):1245–1260, 2007.

[DS84] E. B. Davies and B. Simon. Ultracontractivity and the heat kernel for Schrödinger operators and Dirichlet Laplacians. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 59(2):335–395, 1984.

[DSU08] A. A. Dubkov, B. Spagnolo, and V. V. Uchaikin. Lévy flight superdiffusion: an introduction. *Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos Appl. Sci. Engrg.*, 18(9):2649–2672, 2008.

[FLS08] R. L. Frank, E. H. Lieb, and R. Seiringer. Hardy-Lieb-Thirring inequalities for fractional Schrödinger operators. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 21(4):925–950, 2008.

[GGR12] G. R. Goldstein, J. A. Goldstein, and A. Rhandi. Weighted Hardy's inequality and the Kolmogorov equation perturbed by an inverse-square potential. *Appl. Anal.*, 91(11):2057–2071, 2012.

[GZ03] Jerome A. Goldstein and Qi S. Zhang. Linear parabolic equations with strong singular potentials. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(1):197–211, 2003.

[HWQ+12] Nicolas E. Humphries, Henri Weimerskirch, Nuno Queiroz, Emily J. Southall, and David W. Sims. Foraging success of biological Lévy flights recorded in situ. *PNAS*, 109(19), 2012.

[Kat95] Tosio Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Reprint of the 1980 edition.

[KK10] Kamil Kaleta and Tadeusz Kulczycki. Intrinsic ultracontractivity for Schrödinger operators based on fractional Laplacians. *Potential Anal.*, 33(4):313–339, 2010.

[KLVW] Matthias Keller, Daniel Lenz, Hendrik Vogt, and Radoslaw Wojciechowski. Note on basic features of large time behaviour of heat kernels. *J. Reine und Angew. Math.*, To appear.

[Sto87] P. Stollmann. Admissible and regular potentials for Schrödinger forms. *J. Operator Theory*, 18(1):139–151, 1987.

[Voi86] J. Voigt. Absorption semigroups, their generators, and Schrödinger semigroups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 67(2):167–205, 1986.